



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,260	05/29/2001	James G. Snyder	25049A	5901
22889	7590	10/21/2003		
OWENS CORNING			EXAMINER	
2790 COLUMBUS ROAD			PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C	
GRANVILLE, OH 43023			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/867,260	SNYDER, JAMES G.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher C Pratt	<b>Art Unit</b> 1771	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 25 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 9-11.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a)a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the combination set forth by the examiner fails to teach the layers adhered to one another. To the contrary, McBride clearly teaches adhering the layers together (col. 4, lines 43-45 and col. 5, lines 3-25). Briggs also teaches adhering the layer together (col. 5, lines 49-56).

Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to utilize the LDPE of Briggs in the laminate of McBride or AAPA. While applicant accurately summarizes the law governing *prima facie* obviousness and the MPEP, applicant fails to provide specific reasons why the combination set forth by the examiner would not be obvious. Applicant fails to point out supposed errors in the instant rejection. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to utilize the LDPE of Briggs for the reasons previously set forth.

With respect to the rejection over Patel and Berdan, applicant argues that the references fail to teach the layers adhered to each other. However, Patel specifically teaches the layers to be adhered (abstract). Similarly, Berdan also specifically teaches the layer to be adhered (abstract).

Applicant argues that the references fail to teach applicant's claimed WVTR. However, this property is either inherent or obvious as set forth in the previous action. Applicant has failed to point out deficiencies in the previous rejection.

Applicant argues that Patel teaches away from using a kraft/asphalt facing because it lacks flexibility. Patel may teach away from using the inflexible asphalt facing, but does not teach away from using kraft paper. .



TERREL MORRIS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700